

REMARKS

In response to the non-final office action of December 13, 2006, applicant asks that all claims be allowed in view of the amendment to the claims and the following remarks.

Claims 1-3, 6-9, 12-35, 38-43, 46-53, 56-59, 62-85, 88-93, 96-100 and 109-116 are currently pending, of which claims 1, 7, 13, 24, 35, 39, 43, 47, 51, 57, 63, 74, 85, 89, 93 and 97 are independent. Claims 13-34, 39-42, 47-50, 63-84, 89-92 and 97-100 have been withdrawn, leaving claims 1-3, 6-9, 12, 35, 38, 43, 46, 51-53, 56-59, 62, 85, 88, 93, 96 and 109-116, including independent claims 1, 7, 35, 43, 51, 57, 85 and 93, under consideration. Claims 1, 7, 35, 43, 51, 57, 85 and 93 have been amended, and claims 109-116 have been added. Support for the new claims may be found in the application at, for example, FIGS. 7 and 13C. No new matter has been introduced.

Rejection under Section 103

Claims 1-3, 6-9, 12, 35, 38, 43, 46, 51-53, 56-59, 62, 85, 88, 93 and 96 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103 as being unpatentable over Ritter (U.S. Patent No. 6,657,538) in view of Harkin (U.S. Patent No. 6,327,376) and Wang (U.S. Patent No. 6,175,922). Applicant requests reconsideration and withdrawal of this rejection because neither Ritter, Harkin, Wang nor any proper combination of the references describes or suggests the subject matter of the amended independent claims, as described more fully below.

Claim 1 recites a system for identifying an individual including, among other elements, a display device having pixels. Each pixel includes a light emitting element and a sensor for reading biological information of a user. The light emitting element includes a cathode, a light emitting layer, and an anode.

As acknowledged by the rejection, Ritter does not disclose a display device having pixels, each of which includes a light emitting element and a sensor for reading biological information of a user, with the light-emitting element including a cathode, a light emitting layer and an anode. See action at page 3, lines 5-7. For these features, the rejection relies on Harkin. See action at page 3, lines 7-16.

More particularly, the rejection states: "Harkin further discloses the fingerprint sensor and the thin film components required for the array may be fabricated directly on the surface of the upper plate of the display (col. 9, lines 37-40), *thus the display device has pixels including a light emitting element and a sensor for reading biological information.*" Action at page 3, lines 10-13 (emphasis added). Applicant respectfully disagrees. Specifically, Harkin discloses:

As shown in FIG. 6, the display device and fingerprint sensor 10 are of corresponding size and the fingerprint sensor is disposed directly over the upper plate, here referenced 72, of the display device on its output side with the sensing element array uppermost. For simplicity, the driving circuits for the display device and sensing array and the electrical interconnections have been omitted from FIG. 6. *Conceivably, the plate 72 could be used as the substrate of the fingerprint sensor and the thin film components required for the array fabricated directly on the surface of this plate instead.* Of course, the display device and fingerprint sensor need not be of similar size. With a comparatively large area display device, the fingerprint sensor would be provided over a part only of this area, either by attaching the substrate of the fingerprint sensor onto the surface of the upper plate of the display device or forming the array directly on a part of the *outer* surface of this plate.

Harkin at col. 9, lines 30-46 (emphasis added). Although Harkin indicates that the plate 72 could be used as the substrate of the fingerprint sensor and the thin film components required for the array fabricated directly on the surface of this plate (col. 9, lines 37-40), Harkin provides no indication that elements of the fingerprint sensor are the same size as pixels of the display device such that each pixel would include a sensor. As such, Harkin does not describe or suggest a display device having pixels, where each pixel includes a light emitting element and a sensor for reading biological information, as required by claim 1.

Further, although Harkin discloses that "plates carry a system of electrodes and address conductors defining a row and column matrix array of individual display elements, each possibly having an associated switching device, for example a thin film transistor" (col. 9, lines 22-25), Harkin does not indicate which surface of a plate carries the display elements. Hence, Harkin does not disclose whether or not the fingerprint sensor and thin film components required for the array are fabricated directly on the same surface of the plate which carries the display elements. Therefore, for this additional reason, Harkin does not describe or suggest a display device having pixels, where each pixel includes a light emitting element and a sensor for reading biological information, as recited by claim 1.

The rejection relies on Wang as disclosing a portable authorization device. However, Wang's portable authorization device does not remedy Ritter's and Harkin's failure to describe or suggest a display device having pixels, where each pixel includes a light emitting element and a sensor for reading biological information, as recited by claim 1.

Accordingly, neither Ritter, Harkin, Wang, nor any proper combination of the references describes or suggests a display device having pixels, where each pixel includes a light emitting element and a sensor for reading biological information, as recited by claim 1.

For at least these reasons, applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection of claim 1, and its dependent claims 2, 3 and 6.

Similarly to claim 1, each of independent claims 7, 35, 43, 51, 57, 85 and 93 recites a display device having pixels, where each pixel includes a light emitting element and a sensor for reading biological information of a user. Accordingly, for at least the reasons described above with respect to claim 1, applicant requests reconsideration and withdrawal the rejection of independent claims 7, 35, 43, 51, 57, 85 and 93 and their dependent claims 8, 9, 12, 38, 46, 52, 53, 56, 58, 59, 62, 88 and 96.

New Claims 109-116

Each of claims 109-116 depends from a respective one of independent claims 1, 7, 35, 43, 51, 57, 85 and 93. At least for the reason of that dependency and the reasons noted above with respect to independent claims 1, 7, 35, 43, 51, 57, 85 and 93, applicant submits that claims 109-116 are allowable.

Conclusion

Applicant submits that all claims are in condition for allowance.

It is believed that all of the pending issues have been addressed. However, the absence of a reply to a specific rejection, issue or comment does not signify agreement with or concession of that rejection, issue or comment. In addition, because the arguments made above may not be exhaustive, there may be reasons for patentability of any or all pending claims (or other claims) that have not been expressed. Finally, nothing in this reply should be construed as an intent to

Applicant : Shunpei Yamazaki et al.
Serial No. : 09/833,674
Filed : April 13, 2001
Page : 22 of 22


Attorney's Docket No.: 12732-028001 / US4856

concede any issue with regard to any claim, except as specifically stated in this reply, and the amendment of any claim does not necessarily signify concession of unpatentability of the claim prior to its amendment.

Please apply any charges or credits to deposit account 06-1050.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: March 13, 2007


Barbara A. Benoit
Reg. No. 54,777

Customer No. 26171
Fish & Richardson P.C.
1425 K Street, N.W.
11th Floor
Washington, DC 20005-3500
Telephone: (202) 783-5070
Facsimile: (202) 783-2331